Weight Computation of Regular Tree Languages

Jochen Burghardt

jochen@first.fhg.de

arXiv:1603.02928v1 [cs.FL] 9 Mar 2016

Abstract. We present a general framework to define an application–dependent weight measure on terms that subsumes e.g. total simplification orderings, and an $\mathcal{O}(n \cdot \log n)$ algorithm for the simultaneous computation of the minimal weight of a term in the language of each nonterminal of a regular tree grammar, based on Barzdins' liquid–flow technique.

Keywords. Regular tree language, Term weight, Minimal term, Simplification ordering

1 Introduction

Regular tree grammars or automata [TW68] are a generalization of regular (word) grammars allowing the description of infinite sets of terms, aka. trees. The set of regular tree languages is closed wrt. boolean operations like intersection and complement, language equivalence and the sublanguage property are decidable. They are an important tool in various areas of computer science.

Emmelmann [Emm91,Emm94] used them in a compiler generator to compute optimal target code depending on the instruction set of the target machine, employing a notion of weighted language membership to reflect instruction execution costs. Aiken and Murphy [AM91] exploited the equivalence between regular tree languages and systems of linear set constraints in a type checking algorithm for a functional programming language. In [Bur95] we used regular tree grammars to compute simple invariants of data types that are needed in refinement verification and synthesis. McAllester [McA92] represented congruence classes induced by non–orientable equations in term rewriting by regular tree languages and gave algorithms to rewrite grammars instead of terms. Based on an almost similar representation, Heinz [Hei94,Hei95] computed complete sets of term generalizations wrt. an equational background theory *(E–anti–unification)*. Comon [Com90] used regular tree languages to describe sets of ground constructor terms as sorts, and the corresponding automaton constructions to implement sort operations. He provided a transformation system to decide first–order formulas with equality and sort membership as the only predicates. He showed the decidability of inductive reducibility as an application.

Comon [Com89] pointed out the equivalence between regular tree automata and *elementary sorted signatures*, or linear *term declarations* by Schmidt-Schauß [SS88]; Uribe [Uri92] showed the equivalence to linear *set constraints*; Bachmair et. al. [BGW93] showed the equivalence to the *monadic class*, i.e. the class of first–order

predicate logic formulas with arbitrary quantifiers, with unary predicates only, and without function symbols.

In many of the above applications, it is necessary to enumerate terms of some computed tree language in order of increasing height, or, more generally, some measure of *weight* which is defined dependent on the environment the grammar algorithms are used in. To this end, it is necessary to compute the minimal height, or weight, of each nonterminal's language. As a by–product, this computation also determines which nonterminals produce the empty language, which enables to simplify the grammar accordingly; Aiken and Murphy [AM91] found out that in their application area this optimization had the largest impact on practical run times at all.

In 1991, Barzdin and Barzdin [BB91] proposed their *liquid–flow algorithm* which takes an incompletely given finite algebra and acquires *hypotheses* about what are probable axioms, using a rather involved technique including labeled graphs with several kinds of nodes and arcs. Recently [Bur02], we gave a rational reconstruction of this work that is based on well–known algorithms on regular tree grammars. It revealed that the core of the liquid–flow algorithm in fact amounts to a classical fixpoint algorithm to compute the minimal term heights of all languages generated by nonterminals simultaneously. However, the version of Barzdin and Barzdin has only linear time complexity while the classical algorithm [AM91, Sect.4] is quadratic.

In this paper, we generalize the liquid–flow algorithm to compute used–defined weights instead of heights. In the Sect. 2, we present a rather general framework to define an application–dependent weight measure on terms that subsumes e.g. any total simplification ordering [DJ90, Sect. 5.2] as a special case. In Sect. 3, we show that a naive transfer of Barzdins' liquid–flow technique leads to a sub–quadratic weight computation algorithm only under very restrictive assumptions. In Sect. 4, we present an improved algorithm for our framework that has a time complexity of $\mathcal{O}(n \cdot \log n)$ without any restrictions. We give correctness and complexity proofs for all presented algorithms.

2 Grammars and weights

We assume familiarity with terms and (word) grammars.

Let Σ be a finite set of function symbols, together with their arities. Let ar denote the maximal arity of any function symbol in Σ. We abbreviate the set of all n–ary functions by Σ_n, and the set of all at least n–ary functions by $\Sigma_{\geqslant n}$. Let $\mathcal{T}$ denote the set of ground terms over Σ, defined in the usual way. Let $\mathcal{N}$ be a finite set of nonterminal symbols; we use $nt := \#\mathcal{N}$ to denote its cardinality.

A regular tree grammar is a triple $\mathcal{G} = \langle \Sigma, \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{R} \rangle$, where $\mathcal{R}$ is a finite set of production rules of the form $N ::= f_1(N_{11}, ..., N_{1n_1}) \mid \ldots \mid f_m(N_{m1}, ..., N_{mn_m})$, where $N, N_{ij} \in \mathcal{N}$ and $f_i \in \Sigma_{n_i}$. If some n_i is zero, f_i is a constant; if m is zero, N produces the empty language. We call $f_i(N_{i1}, \ldots, N_{in_i})$ an alternative of the rule for N.

Let al denote the total number of alternatives in the grammar $\mathcal{G}$; we use it as a size measure for $\mathcal{G}$.

For each nonterminal $N \in \mathcal{N}$, exactly one defining rule in $\mathcal{R}$ must exist with N as its left–hand side. Given a fixed grammar $\mathcal{G}$ and a nonterminal $N \in \mathcal{N}$, the language produced by N, viz. $\mathcal{L}(N) \subseteq \mathcal{T}$, is defined in the usual way as the set of all terms derivable from N as the start symbol.

Let D be a set and $(<)$ an irreflexive, total, and well–founded[1] order on D with a maximal element ∞. Let $(\leqslant)$ denote the reflexive closure of $(<)$. A function $\overline{f} : \mathsf{D}^n \longrightarrow \mathsf{D}$ is called monotonic and increasing iff

$$(\bigwedge_{i=1}^{n} x_i \leqslant y_i) \Rightarrow \overline{f}(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \leqslant \overline{f}(y_1, \ldots, y_n) \quad \text{and} \quad \bigwedge_{i=1}^{n} x_i \leqslant \overline{f}(x_1, \ldots, x_n),$$

respectively. $\overline{f}$ is called a weight function iff it is monotonic and increasing. Let D be as above and a signature Σ be given. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f \in \Sigma_n$, let a weight function $\overline{f} : \mathsf{D}^n \longrightarrow \mathsf{D}$ be given. Define $\mathsf{wg} : \mathcal{T} \longrightarrow \mathsf{D}$ inductively by $\mathsf{wg}(f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)) := \overline{f}(\mathsf{wg}(t_1), \ldots, \mathsf{wg}(t_n))$. For $T \subseteq \mathcal{T}$, define

$$\mathsf{wg}(T) := \min\{\mathsf{wg}(t) \mid t \in T\}.$$

Note that $\mathsf{wg}(T) \in \mathsf{D}$ is always well–defined and $\mathsf{wg}(T) = \mathsf{wg}(t)$ for some $t \in T$. If N is a nonterminal of a given regular tree grammar over the signature Σ, we additionally define $\mathsf{wg}(N) := \mathsf{wg}(\mathcal{L}(N))$. A term $t \in \mathcal{L}(N)$ is called minimal wrt. N if $\mathsf{wg}(t) = \mathsf{wg}(N)$. We assume that $\overline{f}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ can always be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(n)$.

The most familiar examples of weight measures are the size $\mathsf{sz}(t)$, and the height $\mathsf{hg}(t)$ of a term t, i.e. the total number of nodes, and the length of the longest path from the root to any leaf, respectively. If $\mathsf{D} := \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ and $\overline{f}(x_1, \ldots, x_n) := 1 + x_1 + \ldots + x_n$ for each $f \in \Sigma_n$, we get $\mathsf{wg}(t) = \mathsf{sz}(t)$; the definitions $\overline{f}(x_1, \ldots, x_n) := 1 + \max\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ for $f \in \Sigma_n$ yield $\mathsf{wg}(t) = \mathsf{hg}(t)$.

For a more pretentious example, let $3 \in \Sigma_0$ and $(+), (\cdot) \in \Sigma_2$, and consider the term $t'(x, y) := x + 3 \cdot y$ with the set of proper subterms $S := \{X, 3, 3 \cdot X\}$. Let $\mathsf{D} := (\mathbb{N} \times S) \cup \{\infty\}$. The following definitions of weight functions lead to $\mathsf{wg}(t)$ being a pair of the number of occurrences of t' in t and the largest term in S occurring at the root of t. Let $i_j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t_j \in \{X, 3, 3 \cdot X\}$; we use infix notation for weight

[1] I.e., each non–empty subset S of D contains a minimal element $\min S \in S$. We additionally define $\min\{\} := \infty$.

functions as well and assume $\overline{f}(\ldots,\infty,\ldots) := \infty$ for all f.

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{3} &:= \langle 0, 3\rangle \\
\langle i_1, 3\rangle \mathbin{\dot{-}} \langle i_2, t_2\rangle &:= \langle i_1 + i_2, 3 \cdot X\rangle \\
\langle i_1, t_1\rangle \mathbin{\dot{-}} \langle i_2, t_2\rangle &:= \langle i_1 + i_2, X\rangle \qquad \text{if } t_1 \neq 3 \\
\langle i_1, t_1\rangle \mathbin{\overline{+}} \langle i_2, 3 \cdot X\rangle &:= \langle i_1 + i_2 + 1, X\rangle \\
\langle i_1, t_1\rangle \mathbin{\overline{+}} \langle i_2, t_2\rangle &:= \langle i_1 + i_2, X\rangle \qquad \text{if } t_2 \neq 3 \cdot X \\
\overline{f}(\langle i_1, t_1\rangle, \ldots, \langle i_n, t_n\rangle) &:= \langle i_1 + \ldots + i_n, X\rangle \text{ for all other } f \in \Sigma
\end{aligned}$$

This example can be generalized to an arbitrary linear term $t'(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$.

The following Lemma characterizes the weight measures wg that can be defined by appropriate weight functions in our framework.

Lemma 1.
Let D, $(<)$, *and a mapping* $\phi : \mathcal{T} \longrightarrow \mathsf{D}$ *be given. There exist weight functions* $\overline{f} : \mathsf{D}^n \longrightarrow \mathsf{D}$ *such that* $\forall t \in \mathcal{T} :\ \mathsf{wg}(t) = \phi(t)$ *iff*

1. $\phi(t') \leqslant \phi(t)$ *if* t' *is a subterm of* t, *and*
2. $\phi(t_1) \leqslant \phi(t_2) \Rightarrow \phi(f(\ldots, t_1, \ldots)) \leqslant \phi(f(\ldots, t_2, \ldots))$.

Proof.
"$\Rightarrow$": Let $\mathsf{wg}(t) = \phi(t)$. Let t' be a subterm of $t = c[t']$; then $\mathsf{wg}(t') \leqslant \mathsf{wg}(t)$ follows from increasingness of weight functions by induction on the height of the context $c[\cdot]$. Property 2. follows directly from monotonicity.

"$\Leftarrow$":

- First note that by 2. and the symmetry of $(\leqslant)$, $t_1 \sim t_2 :\Leftrightarrow \phi(t_1) = \phi(t_2)$ defines a congruence relation on $\mathcal{T}$.
  We denote by $[t] \in \mathcal{T}/_\sim$ the congruence class of $t \in \mathcal{T}$.
  We thus obtain an injective mapping $\phi^* : (\mathcal{T}/_\sim) \longrightarrow \mathsf{D}$ defined by $\phi^*([t]) := \phi(t)$.
  In the following, we may thus assume w.l.o.g. that $\mathcal{T}/_\sim \subseteq \mathsf{D}$,
  i.e. $\phi^*([t]) = [t] = \phi(t)$.
  Assumptions 1. and 2. then read:
  1'. $[t'] \leqslant [t]$ if t' is a subterm of t, and
  2'. $[t_1] \leqslant [t_2] \Rightarrow [f(\ldots, t_1, \ldots)] \leqslant [f(\ldots, t_2, \ldots)]$.
- For $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \mathsf{D}$, define $\overline{f}(x_1, \ldots, x_n) := \min\{[f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)] \mid \bigwedge_{i=1}^n\ x_i \leqslant [t_i]\}$.
- We have $\overline{f}([t_1], \ldots, [t_n]) = [f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)]$ for all $t_1, \ldots, t_n \in \mathcal{T}$:
  $\overline{f}([t_1], \ldots, [t_n]) \leqslant [f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)]$ is obvious, since $\bigwedge_{i=1}^n [t_i] \leqslant [t_i]$.
  For any t_i' with $[t_i] \leqslant [t_i']$ we have by repeated application of 2'. that $[f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)] \leqslant [f(t_1', \ldots, t_n')]$.
  Hence, $[f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)] \leqslant \min\{[f(t_1', \ldots, t_n')] \mid \bigwedge_{i=1}^n [t_i] \leqslant [t_i']\} = \overline{f}([t_1], \ldots, [t_n])$.

– Each $\overline{f}$ is increasing:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\overline{f}(x_1,\ldots,x_n)\\
&= \min\{[f(t_1,\ldots,t_n)] \mid \textstyle\bigwedge_{i=1}^n\ x_i \leqslant [t_i]\} && \text{Def. } \overline{f}\\
&\geqslant \min\{t_j \mid \textstyle\bigwedge_{i=1}^n\ x_i \leqslant [t_i]\} && \text{by 1'.}\\
&\geqslant x_j
\end{aligned}$$

– Each $\overline{f}$ is monotonic:
Let $\bigwedge_{i=1}^n\ x_i \leqslant y_i$, then:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\overline{f}(x_1,\ldots,x_n)\\
&= \min\{[f(t_1,\ldots,t_n)] \mid \textstyle\bigwedge_{i=1}^n\ x_i \leqslant [t_i]\} && \text{Def. } \overline{f}\\
&\leqslant \min\{[f(t_1,\ldots,t_n)] \mid \textstyle\bigwedge_{i=1}^n\ y_i \leqslant [t_i]\} && \text{since } \textstyle\bigwedge_{i=1}^n\ y_i \leqslant [t_i] \Rightarrow \bigwedge_{i=1}^n\ x_i \leqslant [t_i]\\
&= \overline{f}(y_1,\ldots,y_n) && \text{Def. } \overline{f}
\end{aligned}$$

– $\mathsf{wg}(t) = [t]$ for all terms t
follows immediately by induction on t.

□

As an application of Lem. 1, let $\mathsf{D} = \mathcal{T} \cup \{\infty\}$, ordered by a (reflexive) total simplification ordering ($\leqslant$) [DJ90, Sect. 5.2], and let ϕ be the identity function. Property 1. and 2. is satisfied, since ($\leqslant$) contains the subterm ordering and is closed under context application, respectively. Then $\mathsf{wg}(t) = t$ for each term t, i.e., no two distinct terms have the same weight, and $\mathsf{wg}(N)$ yields the least term of $\mathcal{L}(N)$ wrt. ($\leqslant$).

In the rest of this paper, we assume a fixed given grammar $\mathcal{G} = \langle \Sigma, \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{R} \rangle$. For a nonterminal $N \in \mathcal{N}$, we tacitly assume its defining rule to be

$$N ::= f_1(N_{11}, ..., N_{1n_1}) \mid \ldots \mid f_m(N_{m1}, ..., N_{mn_m}).$$

3 Simple Fixpoint Algorithm

First, we adapt the classical algorithm from [AM91] to our framework.

Algorithm 2.
(Naive fixpoint language weight computation) Let $x_N^{(i)} \in \mathsf{D}$ be defined by

– $x_N^{(0)} := \infty$ for each N, and
– $x_N^{(k+1)} := \min\{\overline{f}_i(x_{N_{i1}}^{(k)}, \ldots, x_{N_{in_i}}^{(k)}) \mid 1 \leqslant i \leqslant m\}$ for each N and $k = 1, \ldots, nt$.

In the k'th computation cycle, all $x_N^{(k)}$ are computed from all $x_N^{(k-1)}$ by the above formula. When the algorithm stops after the nt'th cycle, we have $x_N^{(nt)} = \mathsf{wg}(N)$ by Cor. 6 below. Since in each cycle all alternatives are evaluated, we get a time complexity of $\mathcal{O}(nt \cdot al \cdot ar)$. □

Lemma 3.
Given the settings of Alg. 2, we have for all nonterminals N of $\mathcal{G}$, all $t \in \mathcal{L}(N)$, and all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, that $\mathsf{hg}(t) \leqslant k \Rightarrow x_N^{(k)} \leqslant \mathsf{wg}(t)$.

Proof. Induction on k:

- $k = 0$: trivial, since no ground terms of height 0 exist.
- $k \rightsquigarrow k+1$: if $t = f_i(t_1, \ldots, t_{n_i}) \in \mathcal{L}(N)$ has a height $\leqslant k+1$, and assuming the rule $N ::= \bigmid_{i=1}^{m} f_i(N_{i1}, \ldots, N_{in_i})$, we have $\mathsf{hg}(t_j) \leqslant k$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n$, and

  $x_N^{(k+1)}$
  $\leqslant \overline{f}_i(x_{N_{i1}}^{(k)}, \ldots, x_{N_{in_i}}^{(k)})$ Alg. 2
  $\leqslant \overline{f}_i(\mathsf{wg}(t_1), \ldots, \mathsf{wg}(t_{n_i}))$ $t_j \in \mathcal{L}(N_{ij})$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n_i$, I.H., $\overline{f}_i$ monotonic
  $= \mathsf{wg}(t)$ Def. wg

□

Lemma 4.
Given the settings of Alg. 2, we have for all nonterminals N that
$x_N^{(k)} < \infty \Rightarrow \exists t \in \mathcal{L}(N) : \ \mathsf{hg}(t) \leqslant k \wedge x_N^{(k)} = \mathsf{wg}(t)$.

Proof. Induction on k:

- $k = 0$: trivial, since $x_N^{(0)} = \infty$.
- $k \rightsquigarrow k+1$: Assume the rule $N ::= \bigmid_{i=1}^{m} f_i(N_{i1}, \ldots, N_{in_i})$. First, we have

  ∞
  $> x_N^{(k+1)}$ assumption
  $= \min\{\overline{f}_i(x_{N_{i1}}^{(k)}, \ldots, x_{N_{in_i}}^{(k)}) \mid 1 \leqslant i \leqslant m\}$ Alg. 2
  $= \overline{f}_l(x_{N_{l1}}^{(k)}, \ldots, x_{N_{ln_l}}^{(k)})$ for some $l \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$ Def. min
  $\geqslant x_{N_{lj}}^{(k)}$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n_l$ $\overline{f}_l$ increasing

  If $n_l = 0$, $f_l \in \mathcal{L}(N)$ and $\mathsf{wg}(f_l) = \overline{f}_l = x_N^{(k+1)}$ as above, and we are done.
  If $n_l > 0$, by induction hypothesis, for each $j = 1, \ldots, n_l$ exists some $t_j \in \mathcal{L}(N_{lj})$ with $\mathsf{hg}(t_j) \leqslant k$ and $x_{N_{lj}}^{(k)} = \mathsf{wg}(t_j)$,
  hence $f_l(t_1, \ldots, t_{n_l}) \in \mathcal{L}(N) \wedge \mathsf{hg}(f_l(t_1, \ldots, t_{n_l})) \leqslant k+1$, and

  $\mathsf{wg}(f_l(t_1, \ldots, t_{n_l}))$
  $= \overline{f}_l(\mathsf{wg}(t_1), \ldots, \mathsf{wg}(t_{n_l}))$ Def. wg
  $= \overline{f}_l(x_{N_{l1}}^{(k)}, \ldots, x_{N_{ln_l}}^{(k)})$ property of the t_j
  $= \min\{\overline{f}_i(x_{N_{i1}}^{(k)}, \ldots, x_{N_{in_i}}^{(k)}) \mid 1 \leqslant i \leqslant m\}$ Def. l
  $= x_N^{(k+1)}$ Alg. 2

  (Note that this induction step holds even for $k = 1$, since $x_N^{(1)} < \infty$ requires some nullary f_l in the rule of N.) □

Lemma 5.
$x_N^{(k)} = \min\{\mathsf{wg}(t) \mid t \in \mathcal{L}(N),\ \mathsf{hg}(t) \leqslant k\}$.

Proof.
For $x_N^{(k)} = \infty$, we have $\min\{\mathsf{wg}(t) \mid t \in \mathcal{L}(N), \mathsf{hg}(t) \leqslant k\} = \infty$ by Lemma 3.
For $x_N^{(k)} < \infty$, let t_0 be the term obtained by Lemma 4. Then:

$x_N^{(k)}$	
$\leqslant \min\{\mathsf{wg}(t) \mid t \in \mathcal{L}(N), \mathsf{hg}(t) \leqslant k\}$	Lemma 3
$\leqslant \mathsf{wg}(t_0)$	since $t_0 \in \mathcal{L}(N), \mathsf{hg}(t_0) \leqslant k$
$= x_N^{(k)}$	Lemma 4

□

Corollary 6.
(Correctness of Alg. 2) $x_N^{(nt)} = \mathsf{wg}(N)$ *for all* N.

Proof.
If $\mathcal{L}(N) = \{\}$, we have by Cor. 5 that $x_N^{(k)} = \infty = \mathsf{wg}(N)$ for all k.
Else, by the pumping lemma for regular tree languages [CDG+99, Sect. 1.2], we can find for each term $t \in \mathcal{L}(N)$ with $\mathsf{hg}(t) > k \geqslant nt$ a smaller one $t' \in \mathcal{L}(N)$ with $\mathsf{hg}(t') \leqslant nt$.

Since all weight functions $\overline{f}$ are increasing, the well–known construction of t' from t ensures that $\mathsf{wg}(t') \leqslant \mathsf{wg}(t)$; i.e., t does not contribute to the minimum $\mathsf{wg}(N)$. Hence:

$\mathsf{wg}(N)$	
$= \min\{\mathsf{wg}(t) \mid t \in \mathcal{L}(N)\}$	Def. wg
$= \min\{\mathsf{wg}(t) \mid t \in \mathcal{L}(N), \mathsf{hg}(t) \leqslant k\}$	see above
$= x_N^{(k)}$	Cor. 5

□

Next, we apply Barzdins' liquid–flow technique in a straight forward way to Alg. 2. The basic idea is to recompute an alternative only if some of its argument values has changed, i.e. belongs to the *water front*.

Algorithm 7.
(Barzdins' liquid–flow technique) The weights of all nonterminals can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(nt \cdot al \cdot ar)$, using the following fixpoint algorithm. Maintain a set $F \subseteq \mathcal{N}$, called *water front* in [BB91], such that $F^{(k+1)} = \{N \in \mathcal{N} \mid x_N^{(k+1)} < x_N^{(k)}\}$ for all $k \in I\!N$. Define

- $x_N^{(0)} := \infty$ for each N,
- $x_N^{(1)} := \min\{\overline{f}_i \mid 1 \leqslant i \leqslant m,\ f_i \in \Sigma_0\}$ for each N, and

– $x_N^{(k+1)} := \min(\{x_N^{(k)}\} \cup \{\overline{f}_i(x_{N_{i1}}^{(k)}, \ldots, x_{N_{in_i}}^{(k)}) \mid 1 \leqslant i \leqslant m,\ \bigvee_{j=1}^{n_i}\ N_{ij} \in F^{(k)}\})$
for each N and each $k \in I\!N$.
– Stop the computation after cycle $(k+1)$, if $F^{(k+1)}$ is empty.

In cycle (1), the entire grammar has to be inspected once, to compute $x_N^{(1)}$ and at the same time $F^{(1)}$. In each later cycle, we tacitly assume that we need to inspect only those alternatives $f_i(N_{i1}, \ldots, N_{in_i})$ for which $N_{ij} \in F^{(k)}$ for some $j \in \{1, \ldots, n_i\}$.

As in [BB91], an appropriate pointer structure, linking each nonterminal N_{ij} (*domain node* in [BB91]) to all alternatives *(functional nodes)* it occurs in, is assumed to have been built before cycle (0), by inspecting the whole grammar once.

Below we will show linear complexity under certain restrictive requirements to the weight functions. □

It is easy to see by induction on k that each $x_N^{(k)}$ has the same value in Alg. 7 as in Alg. 2. Since $F^{(k)} = \{\} \Rightarrow x_N^{(k+1)} = x_N^{(k)} \wedge F^{(k+1)} = \{\}$, the algorithm may stop in this case.

Q_0	$::= a$
Q_{n+1}	$::= q(P_{n+1}) \mid j(Q_n)$
P_{n+1}	$::= p(Q_n)$

$\overline{q}(x)$	$:= x$
$\overline{p}(x)$	$:= 2 \cdot x$
$\overline{j}(x)$	$:= 2 \cdot x + 1$
$\overline{a}$	$:= 0$

$\mathcal{L}(Q_n)$	hg	wg
$qp \ldots qpa$	$2 \cdot n + 1$	0
$j \ldots ja$	$n + 1$	$2^n - 1$

Fig. 1. Example grammar, weight functions, and minimal / maximal terms

k	Q_0	P_1	Q_1	P_2	Q_2	P_3	Q_3
0	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞
1	a 0						
2		pa 0	ja 1				
3			qpa 0	pja 2	jja 3		
4				$pqpa$ 0	$jqpa$ 1 ($qpja$ 2)	$pjja$ 6	$jjja$ 7
5					$qpqpa$ 0	$pjqpa$ 2	$jjqpa$ 3 ($qpjja$ 6)
6						$pqpqpa$ 0	$jqpqpa$ 1 ($qpjqpa$ 2)
7							$qpqpqpa$ 0

Fig. 2. Algorithm 2 / 7 running on the example grammar

As an example, let $\Sigma_0 := \{a\}$ and $\Sigma_1 := \{q, p, j\}$; consider the grammar (left) and weight functions (middle) shown in Fig. 1, where $\mathsf{D} := I\!N \cup \{\infty\}$ and $n = 0, \ldots, n_{\max}$.

The grammar has $2 \cdot n_{\max} + 1$ rules and $3 \cdot n_{\max} + 1$ alternatives. Since we have at most unary functions, we can omit parentheses around function arguments in terms to enhance readability and to indicate the connection to word grammars.

Observe that each term t in $\mathcal{L}(Q_n)$ can be read as a binary number in reversed notation[2], e.g. $\mathcal{L}(Q_3) \ni qpjja \mathrel{\hat{=}} 110$, and that by construction the weight $\mathsf{wg}(t)$ corresponds to this binary number, e.g. $\mathsf{wg}(qpjja) = 6$.

In this correspondence, $\mathcal{L}(Q_n)$ is the set of all binary numbers with exactly n digits; in particular, each $\mathcal{L}(Q_n)$ is finite. Hence, both a term of maximal height and of maximal weight exists, by construction, it has minimal weight and minimal height, respectively; cf. Fig. 1 (right).

Figure 2 shows the cycles of Alg. 2 in computing the weights of each Q_n and P_n, where $n_{\max} = 3$. For each nonterminal N, the right entry in its column shows the value of $x_N^{(k)}$ while the left entry shows a term of this weight in $\mathcal{L}(N)$. Empty entries mean that $x_N^{(k)} = x_N^{(k-1)}$. Entries in parentheses are computed by the algorithm, but don't lead to an update, since they are larger than their predecessors.

The algorithm stops after cycle (7), since there are 7 distinct nonterminals in the grammar. Since Alg. 7 computes the same values as Alg. 2, Fig. 2 illustrates both algorithms simultaneously. The water front $F^{(k)}$ consists of all nonterminals having a nonempty entry in line k, except for $k = 0$.

Next, we give a sufficient criterion for Alg. 7 to run in linear time. Define

$$\begin{aligned} l_0 &:= \min\{\overline{f} \mid f \in \Sigma_0\}, \\ h_0 &:= \max\{\overline{f} \mid f \in \Sigma_0\}, \\ l(x) &:= \min\{\overline{f}(l_0, ..., x, ..., l_0) \mid f \in \Sigma_{\geqslant 1}\}, \text{ and} \\ h(x) &:= \max\{\overline{f}(x, \ldots, x) \mid f \in \Sigma_{\geqslant 1}\}. \end{aligned}$$

In the definition of $l(x)$, the minimum ranges over all argument positions of x, e.g. $l(x) = \min\{\overline{g}(x, l_0), \overline{g}(l_0, x)\}$ if $\Sigma_{\geqslant 1} = \Sigma_2 = \{g\}$. Note that the maxima in the definitions of h_0 and $h(x)$ are well–defined since they range over a finite set each.

Lemma 8.
In the settings of Alg. 2, we have for each $N \in \mathcal{N}$ and each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ that $x_N^{(k+1)} < x_N^{(k)}$ iff some $t \in \mathcal{L}(N)$ exists with $\mathsf{hg}(t) = k + 1$ and $\mathsf{wg}(t) < \mathsf{wg}(t')$ for each $t' \in \mathcal{L}(N)$ with $\mathsf{hg}(t') \leqslant k$.

Proof. Follows immediately from Cor. 5,
since $\min A < \min B$ iff $\exists a \in A \setminus B \; \forall b \in B : \; a < b$ for arbitrary ordered sets. □

[2] Think of "q" and "p" as forming the left and right half of the digit "0", respectively, think of "j" as of the digit "1", and ignore "a".

Lemma 9.
If some $p_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ exists such that $\#\{d \in \mathsf{D} \mid l^i(l_0) \leqslant d \leqslant h^i(h_0)\} \leqslant p_0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, then each $x_N^{(\cdot)}$ can change its value at most p_0 times during the execution of Alg. 2. (Here, $l^i(l_0)$ denotes the i–fold application of l to l_0, etc.)

Proof.

1. $l(\cdot)$ and $h(\cdot)$ are monotonic and increasing:
   If $x \leqslant y$, then $\overline{f}(l_0, ..., x, ..., l_0) \leqslant \overline{f}(l_0, ..., y, ..., l_0)$ for all $f \in \Sigma_{\geqslant 1}$, and hence $l(x) \leqslant l(y)$. Since $x \leqslant \overline{f}(l_0, ..., x, ..., l_0)$ for all $f \in \Sigma_{\geqslant 1}$, we have $x \leqslant l(x)$. Similar for the monotonicity and increasingness of h.
2. $l_0 \leqslant \overline{f} \leqslant h_0$ for all $f \in \Sigma_0$:
   Obvious.
3. $l(\max\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}) \leqslant \overline{f}(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \leqslant h(\max\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\})$
   for all $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ in the range of wg and all $f \in \Sigma_{\geqslant 1}$:
   Since each x_i is in the range of wg, we have $l_0 \leqslant x_i$.
   W.l.o.g. let $x_1 = \max\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$. Then,
   $$\begin{aligned}
   & l(x_1) \\
   \leqslant\ & \overline{f}(x_1, l_0, ..., l_0) && \text{Def. } l \\
   \leqslant\ & \overline{f}(x_1, \ldots, x_n) && l_0 \leqslant x_i \\
   \leqslant\ & \overline{f}(x_1, \ldots, x_1) && x_i \leqslant x_1 \\
   \leqslant\ & h(x_1) && \text{Def. } h
   \end{aligned}$$
4. $l^{\mathsf{hg}(t)-1}(l_0) \leqslant \mathsf{wg}(t) \leqslant h^{\mathsf{hg}(t)-1}(h_0)$ for all $t \in \mathcal{T}$:
   Induction on t:
   If $t = f$ is a constant, we have $l^{\mathsf{hg}(t)-1}(l_0) = l_0 \leqslant \overline{f} = \mathsf{wg}(t) \leqslant h_0 = h^{\mathsf{hg}(t)-1}(h_0)$.
   If $t = f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$, we have $\mathsf{hg}(t_i) = \mathsf{hg}(t) - 1$ for some $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$,
   and $\mathsf{hg}(t_j) \leqslant \mathsf{hg}(t) - 1$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, n$. Hence,
   $$\begin{aligned}
   & l^{\mathsf{hg}(t)-1}(l_0) \\
   \leqslant\ & l(\mathsf{wg}(t_i)) && \text{since } l^{\mathsf{hg}(t)-2}(l_0) = l^{\mathsf{hg}(t_i)-1}(l_0) \leqslant \mathsf{wg}(t_i) \text{ by I.H.} \\
   \leqslant\ & l(\max\{\mathsf{wg}(t_1), \ldots, \mathsf{wg}(t_n)\}) && \text{Def. max,} \quad i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \\
   \leqslant\ & \overline{f}(\mathsf{wg}(t_1), \ldots, \mathsf{wg}(t_n)) && \text{by 3.} \\
   =\ & \mathsf{wg}(t) && \text{Def. } \mathsf{wg}(t) \\
   \leqslant\ & h(\max\{\mathsf{wg}(t_1), \ldots, \mathsf{wg}(t_n)\}) && \text{by 3.} \\
   \leqslant\ & h^{\mathsf{hg}(t)-1}(h_0) && \text{since } \mathsf{wg}(t_j) \leqslant h^{\mathsf{hg}(t)-2}(h_0) \text{ for all } j \text{ by I.H.}
   \end{aligned}$$
5. If in Alg. 2 the value of $x_N^{(\cdot)}$ changes at $k = k_1, \ldots, k_p$, then $p \leqslant p_0$:
   Let $\{k_1, \ldots, k_p\} := \{k + 1 \in \mathbb{N} \mid x_N^{(k+1)} < x_N^{(k)}\}$ and $k_1 < \ldots < k_p$.
   From Cor. 8, we obtain $t_1, \ldots, t_p \in \mathcal{L}(N)$
   such that $\mathsf{hg}(t_i) = k_i$ and $\mathsf{wg}(t_i) = x_N^{(k_i)}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, p$.
   From 4., we thus have
   $l^{k_p-1}(l_0) \leqslant \mathsf{wg}(t_p) = x_N^{(k_p)} < \ldots < x_N^{(k_1)} = \mathsf{wg}(t_1) \leqslant h^{k_1-1}(h_0) \leqslant \ldots \leqslant h^{k_p-1}(h_0)$.
   Hence, by assumption $p \leqslant p_0$. □

Let us compute the time requirements of Alg. 7 under the assumption of Lem. 9. Let C_N denote the number of cycles where $x_N^{(\cdot)}$ changes its value during the computation, i.e. where $x_N^{(k+1)} < x_N^{(k)}$. From Lem. 9, we get $C_N \leqslant p_0$ for all $N \in \mathcal{N}$ and some $p_0 \in I\!N$ depending not on the grammar, but only on the choice of the weight functions. A certain alternative $\overline{f}_i(x_{N_{i1}}^{(k)}, \ldots, x_{N_{in_i}}^{(k)})$ is recomputed

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} C_{N_{ij}} \leqslant \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} p_0 \leqslant ar \cdot p_0$$

times during algorithm execution. Altogether, there are at most $al \cdot ar \cdot p_0$ re–computations of alternatives, requiring time $\mathcal{O}(al \cdot ar^2 \cdot p_0)$, including updating the respective $x_N^{(\cdot)}$. Initialization of the pointer structure and cycles (0) and (1) requires time $\mathcal{O}(al \cdot ar + nt + al)$. Hence, we get an overall time requirement of $\mathcal{O}(al \cdot ar^2 \cdot p_0)$, i.e. the algorithm runs linear in the number of alternatives.

In the binary numbers example from above, the computation still takes $\mathcal{O}(n_{\max}^2)$ cycles since the requirements of Lem. 9 are not satisfied. In general, these requirements are violated as soon as there are two weight functions $\overline{f}$ and $\overline{g}$ such that $\overline{f}(x) < \overline{g}(x)$ for all $x \in \mathsf{D}$ and $\overline{g}$ is strictly monotonic[3], since then

$$l^i(l_0) \leqslant \overline{f}^i(l_0) < \overline{g}(\overline{f}^{i-1}(l_0)) < \overline{g}^2(\overline{f}^{i-2}(l_0)) < \ldots < \overline{g}^i(l_0) \leqslant h^i(h_0).$$

At least, the requirements hold if $\mathsf{wg}(t) = \mathsf{hg}(t)$, thus we can duplicate the result of Barzdin [BB91], and improve the time complexity for the optimization of Aiken and Murphy [AM91] based on detecting nonterminals producing the empty language.

In the following section, we present an improved algorithm which takes at most $\mathcal{O}(al \cdot \log nt)$ time in any case.

4 Lazy Propagation Algorithm

As we saw above, a naive transfer of Barzdins' liquid–flow technique to our framework is not sufficient to obtain a sub–quadratic weight computation algorithm, except for very special cases. The reason for this is essentially that the algorithm considers terms in order of increasing height, cf. Lem. 5, but terms with small height may have large weight and vice versa. For example, in Fig. 2, the value $x_{Q_1}^{(2)} = 1$ is propagated to $x_{P_2}^{(3)} = 2$ and $x_{Q_2}^{(3)} = 3$; in the next cycle, the value improves to $x_{Q_1}^{(3)} = 0$, and both propagations have to be redone, leading to $x_{P_2}^{(4)} = 0$ and $x_{Q_2}^{(4)} = 1$, of which the latter is still non–optimal.

The basic idea of the following improved liquid–flow algorithm is to defer propagation of a $x_N^{(k)}$ value until we safely know it is the final, minimal one for N, following the

[3] I.e., $x < y \Rightarrow \overline{g}(x) < \overline{g}(y)$. We use unary functions for simplicity; the argument is similar for higher arity functions.

motto *less haste more speed*. The algorithm may need more computation cycles[4], but in each cycle less updates are made, and, more important, the right updates are made.

Algorithm 10.
(Lazy propagation) The weights of all nonterminals can be computed using the following improved fixpoint algorithm.

Maintain three sets of nonterminals $F^{(k)}$, $M^{(k)}$, and $D^{(k)}$, called *water front*, *minimals*, and *done*, respectively. For $N \in \mathcal{N}$, let $x_N^{(0)} := \infty$; let $F^{(0)} := \{\}$, $M^{(0)} := \{\}$, $D^{(0)} := \{\}$, and, for simplicity of proofs, $D^{(-1)} := \{\}$.

For each N and each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, define

$$\begin{aligned}
x_N^{(k+1)} &:= \min(\{x_N^{(k)}\} \cup \{\overline{f}_i(x_{N_{i1}}^{(k)}, \ldots, x_{N_{in_i}}^{(k)}) \mid 1 \leqslant i \leqslant m \wedge \textstyle\bigwedge_{j=1}^{n_i} N_{ij} \in D^{(k)}\}) \\
F^{(k+1)} &:= (F^{(k)} \cup \{N \mid x_N^{(k+1)} < x_N^{(k)}\}) \setminus D^{(k)}, \\
M^{(k+1)} &:= \{N \in F^{(k+1)} \mid \forall N' \in F^{(k+1)} : \ x_N^{(k+1)} \leqslant x_{N'}^{(k+1)}\}, \qquad \text{and} \\
D^{(k+1)} &:= D^{(k)} \cup M^{(k+1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Stop if $F^{(k+1)} = \{\}$. □

Informally, this algorithm works as follows. When an $x_N^{(\cdot)}$ value changes, i.e. $x_N^{(k+1)} < x_N^{(k)}$, we add N to the *water front* $F^{(k+1)}$, as does Alg. 7. However, only those N having minimal $x_N^{(k+1)}$ values in $F^{(k+1)}$ are used for propagation. They are collected in the set *minimal*, i.e. $M^{(k+1)}$, and added to the set *done*, i.e. $D^{(k+1)}$.

In Lem. 12 below, we will show that their $x_N^{(\cdot)}$ value in fact doesn't change any further. This is what is intuitively expected, since only larger values are in circulation.

At first glance, we observe the following facts about Alg. 10.

Lemma 11.

1. $D^{(k)} = \bigcup_{i=0}^{k} M^{(i)}$, *where all* $M^{(i)}$ *are pairwise disjoint.*
2. $D^{(k)} \subseteq D^{(k+1)}$, *and* $D^{(k)} \subset D^{(k+1)} \Leftrightarrow M^{(k+1)} \neq \{\} \Leftrightarrow F^{(k+1)} \neq \{\}$.
3. $x_N^{(k)} \geqslant x_N^{(k+1)}$.
4. $N \in F^{(k)} \cup D^{(k)}$ *iff* $x_N^{(k)} < \infty$; *both implies* $\exists k' : \ N \in D^{(k')}$.
5. *If* $N \in M^{(k)}$ *and* $N' \notin D^{(k-1)}$, *then* $x_N^{(k)} \leqslant x_{N'}^{(k)}$.
6. $N \in F^{(k+1)} \setminus F^{(k)}$ *iff* $x_N^{(k+1)} < \infty = x_N^{(k)}$.

Proof.

[4] In fact, this is not the case, as shown in Lem. 20 below.

1. $D^{(k)} = \bigcup_{i=0}^{k} M^{(i)}$ follows from Def. $D^{(\cdot)}$.
   To see the disjointness, note that
   $N \in M^{(k)} \Rightarrow N \in F^{(k)} \Rightarrow N \notin D^{(k-1)}$ by Def. $M^{(k)}, F^{(k)}$.
2. $D^{(k)} \subseteq D^{(k+1)}$ follows from Def. $D^{(k+1)}$.
   $D^{(k)} \subset D^{(k+1)} \Leftrightarrow M^{(k+1)} \neq \{\}$ follows from 1.
   $M^{(k+1)} \neq \{\} \Leftrightarrow F^{(k+1)} \neq \{\}$ follows from Def. $M^{(k+1)}$.
3. Follows from Def. $x_N^{(k+1)}$.
4. First, we show $N \notin F^{(k)} \cup D^{(k-1)} \Rightarrow x_N^{(k)} = \infty$ by induction on k:
   $k = 0$: $\quad x_N^{(0)} = \infty$ for all N.
   $k \rightsquigarrow k+1$:

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
 & N \notin F^{(k+1)} \wedge N \notin D^{(k)} & \\
\Rightarrow x_N^{(k+1)} = x_N^{(k)} \wedge N \notin F^{(k)} & \wedge N \notin D^{(k-1)} & \text{by Def. } F^{(\cdot)} \text{ and 2.} \\
\Rightarrow x_N^{(k+1)} = x_N^{(k)} = \infty & & \text{by I.H.}
\end{array}
$$

   Next, if $N \in F^{(k)}$, let k' be minimal with that property,
   then $x_N^{(k)} \leqslant x_N^{(k')} < x_N^{(k'-1)} \leqslant \infty$, using 3.
   If $N \in D^{(k)}$, then $N \in M^{(k')} \subseteq F^{(k')}$ for some $k' \leqslant k$ by 1.;
   hence $x_N^{(k)} \leqslant x_N^{(k')} < \infty$ by 3.
   Finally, assume for contradiction $N \in F^{(k)}$ and $N \notin D^{(k')}$ for all $k' \in \mathbb{N}$.
   Then $N \in F^{(k'+1)}$ for all $k' \geqslant k$ by Def. $F^{(k'+1)}$.
   From 2., we get $\#D^{(k+nt+1)} > nt$, where $nt = \#\mathcal{N}$,
   which contradicts $D^{(k+nt+1)} \subseteq \mathcal{N}$.
5. If $N' \in F^{(k)}$, we have $x_N^{(k)} \leqslant x_{N'}^{(k)}$ by Def. $M^{(k)}$.
   If $N' \notin F^{(k)} \supseteq M^{(k)}$, then $N' \notin D^{(k)}$ by 1., and we have $x_N^{(k)} \leqslant \infty = x_{N'}^{(k)}$ by 4.
6. "$\Rightarrow$":

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
N \notin F^{(k)} \text{ and } N \in F^{(k+1)} & \\
\Rightarrow x_N^{(k+1)} < x_N^{(k)} \text{ and } N \notin D^{(k)} & \text{Def. } F^{(k+1)} \\
\Rightarrow x_N^{(k)} = \infty & \text{by 4.}
\end{array}
$$

   "$\Leftarrow$":

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
x_N^{(k+1)} < \infty = x_N^{(k)} & \\
\Rightarrow \quad N \in F^{(k+1)} \vee N \in D^{(k)} & \text{Def. } F^{(k+1)} \\
\text{and } N \notin F^{(k)} \cup D^{(k)} & \text{by 4.} \\
\Rightarrow \quad N \notin F^{(k)} \text{ and } N \in F^{(k+1)} &
\end{array}
$$

□

We now prove the core property of Alg. 10:
the values corresponding to nonterminals in the *done* set don't change any more.

Lemma 12.
If $N \in D^{(k)}$ and $k \leqslant k'$, then $x_N^{(k)} = x_N^{(k')}$.

Proof.
We show

$$\forall k' \in \mathbb{N}\ \ \forall k \leqslant k'\ \ \forall N \in M^{(k)}\ \ \forall N' \notin D^{(k-1)} :\ \ x_N^{(k)} \leqslant x_{N'}^{(k')}$$

by induction on k'. The case $k' = 0$ is trivial, since then $k = 0$ and $x_N^{(0)} = \infty = x_{N'}^{(0)}$.
In the case $k' \rightsquigarrow k' + 1$, we have to show
$x_N^{(k)} \leqslant x_{N'}^{(k'+1)}$ for $k \leqslant k' + 1$ and $N \in M^{(k)}, N' \notin D^{(k-1)}$.
We are done by Lem. 11.5 if $k = k' + 1$, so let $k \leqslant k'$ in the following.
Consider the definition of $x_{N'}^{(k'+1)}$.
If $x_{N'}^{(k'+1)} = x_{N'}^{(k')}$, we are done immediately, using the I.H. $x_N^{(k)} \leqslant x_{N'}^{(k')}$.
If $x_{N'}^{(k'+1)} = \overline{f}_i(x_{N'_{i1}}^{(k')}, \ldots, x_{N'_{in_i}}^{(k')})$ for some $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$ with $N'_{i1}, \ldots, N'_{in_i} \in D^{(k')}$, we distinguish the following cases:

- $N'_{ij} \in D^{(k-1)}$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, n_i\}$:
  Note that this implies $k > 0$ or $n_i = 0$.
  By Lem. 11.1, for each $j = 1, \ldots, n_i$ some $k_j \leqslant k - 1$ exists with $N'_{ij} \in M^{(k_j)}$.
  We have for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, n_i\}$:

  $$\begin{aligned}
  & x_{N'_{ij}}^{(k_j)} \\
  \leqslant\ & x_{N'_{ij}}^{(k')} && \text{by I.H., since } N'_{ij} \in M^{(k_j)}, \text{ hence } N'_{ij} \notin D^{(k_j-1)}, \text{ and } k_j \leqslant k' \\
  \leqslant\ & x_{N'_{ij}}^{(k-1)} && \text{by Lem. 11.3, since } k - 1 \leqslant k' \\
  \leqslant\ & x_{N'_{ij}}^{(k_j)} && \text{by Lem. 11.3, since } k_j \leqslant k - 1
  \end{aligned}$$

  That is, all these terms are equal; in particular, $x_{N'_{ij}}^{(k-1)} = x_{N'_{ij}}^{(k')}$ for all j. Hence:

  $$\begin{aligned}
  & x_N^{(k)} \\
  \leqslant\ & x_{N'}^{(k)} && \text{by Lem. 11.5, since } N \in M^{(k)}, N' \notin D^{(k-1)} \\
  \leqslant\ & \overline{f}_i(x_{N'_{i1}}^{(k-1)}, \ldots, x_{N'_{in_i}}^{(k-1)}) && \text{by Alg. 10, since } N'_{ij} \in D^{(k-1)} \text{ for all } j \\
  =\ & \overline{f}_i(x_{N'_{i1}}^{(k')}, \ldots, x_{N'_{in_i}}^{(k')}) && \text{as shown above} \\
  =\ & x_{N'}^{(k'+1)} && \text{by assumption}
  \end{aligned}$$

- $N'_{ij} \notin D^{(k-1)}$ for some $j \in \{1, \ldots, n_i\}$:

  $$\begin{aligned}
  & x_N^{(k)} \\
  \leqslant\ & x_{N'_{ij}}^{(k')} && \text{by I.H., since } N \in M^{(k)},\ N'_{ij} \notin D^{(k-1)},\ k \leqslant k' \\
  \leqslant\ & \overline{f}_i(x_{N'_{i1}}^{(k')}, \ldots, x_{N'_{in_i}}^{(k')}) && \text{since } \overline{f}_i \text{ is increasing} \\
  =\ & x_{N'}^{(k'+1)} && \text{by assumption}
  \end{aligned}$$

This completes the induction proof.

Now, if $N \in D^{(k)}$, then $N \in M^{(k'')}$ for some $k'' \leqslant k$,
and we get $x_N^{(k'')} \leqslant x_N^{(k')}$ from above and $x_N^{(k')} \leqslant x_N^{(k)} \leqslant x_N^{(k'')}$ from Lem. 11.3,
i.e. all these values are equal. □

Corollary 13.
Let $N, N' \in \mathcal{N}, \quad k \leqslant k', \quad N \in D^{(k)}, \quad$ *and* $N' \notin D^{(k-1)}$. *Then:*

1. $x_N^{(k)} = x_N^{(k')}$, *and*
2. $x_N^{(k)} \leqslant x_{N'}^{(k')}$.

Proof.

1. $N \in D^{(k)}$
   $\Rightarrow N \in M^{(k'')}$ for some $k'' \leqslant k$ by Lem. 11.1
   $\Rightarrow N \notin D^{(k''-1)}$ by Lem. 11.1
   $\Rightarrow x_N^{(k'')} \leqslant x_N^{(k')} \leqslant x_N^{(k)} \leqslant x_N^{(k'')}$ by Lem. 12 and 11.3, since $k'' \leqslant k \leqslant k'$
2. $N \in D^{(k)}$
   $\Rightarrow N \in M^{(k'')}$ for some $k'' \leqslant k$ by Lem. 11.1
   $\wedge N' \notin D^{(k''-1)}$ by Lem. 11.2, since $k''-1 \leqslant k-1$
   $\Rightarrow x_N^{(k)} \leqslant x_N^{(k'')} \leqslant x_{N'}^{(k')}$ by Lem. 11.3 and 12, since $k'' \leqslant k \leqslant k'$

□

Lemma 14.
$F^{(k+1)} = (F^{(k)} \cup \{N \mid x_N^{(k+1)} < x_N^{(k)}\}) \setminus M^{(k)}$.

Proof. "$\subseteq$": obvious, since $D^{(k)} \supseteq M^{(k)}$ by 11.1.
"$\supseteq$": If $N \in F^{(k)}$ and $N \notin M^{(k)}$, then $N \notin D^{(k-1)}$ by Def. $F^{(k)}$,
hence $N \notin D^{(k)} = D^{(k-1)} \cup M^{(k)}$ by 11.1.
If $x_N^{(k+1)} < x_N^{(k)}$ and $N \notin M^{(k)}$,
then $N \notin D^{(k)}$, since else $x_N^{(k+1)} = x_N^{(k)}$ by Lem. 12. □

Lemma 15.
$N \in D^{(k)} \Rightarrow \exists t \in \mathcal{L}(N) : \ \mathsf{wg}(t) = x_N^{(k)}$.

Proof. Induction on k:

– $k = 0$: trivial, since $D^{(0)} = \{\}$.

– $k \rightsquigarrow k+1$:

First, we have

$N \in D^{(k+1)}$

$\Rightarrow N \in M^{(k')} \subseteq F^{(k')}$ for some $k' \leqslant k+1$ by Lem. 11.1

$\Rightarrow x_N^{(k'')} < x_N^{(k''-1)}$ for some $k'' \leqslant k'$ by Def. $F^{(\cdot)}$

$\Rightarrow x_N^{(k'')} = \overline{f}_i(x_{N_{i1}}^{(k''-1)}, \ldots, x_{N_{in_i}}^{(k''-1)})$

for some i with $\forall j : N_{ij} \in D^{(k''-1)}$ by Alg. 10

Let k''' be the maximal k'' with that property, i.e., let

$k''' = \max\{k'' \in I\!N \mid k'' \leqslant k',\ \exists i : x_N^{(k'')} = \overline{f}_i(x_{N_{i1}}^{(k''-1)}, \ldots, x_{N_{in_i}}^{(k''-1)}) \wedge \forall j : N_{ij} \in D^{(k''-1)}\}$.

Then:

$x_N^{(k+1)}$

$= x_N^{(k')}$ by Cor. 13.1, since $N \in D^{(k')}$

$= x_N^{(k'-1)} = \ldots = x_N^{(k''')}$ by Def. k'''

$= \overline{f}_i(x_{N_{i1}}^{(k'''-1)}, \ldots, x_{N_{in_i}}^{(k'''-1)})$

for some i with $\forall j : N_{ij} \in D^{(k'''-1)}$ by Def. k'''

$= \overline{f}_i(\mathsf{wg}(t_1), \ldots, \mathsf{wg}(t_{n_i}))$

for some $t_j \in \mathcal{L}(N_{ij})$ by I.H., since $k''' \leqslant k' \leqslant k+1$

$= \mathsf{wg}(f_i(t_1, \ldots, t_{n_i}))$ by Def. $\mathsf{wg}(\cdot)$ □

Lemma 16.

Let $N \in \mathcal{N}$ with $\mathcal{L}(N) \neq \{\}$ be given.

Then, a derivation $N \xrightarrow{*} t$ exists such that each subterm t' of t is minimal wrt. the nonterminal $\nu(t')$ it has been derived from (Note that in a nondeterministic grammar, $\nu(\cdot)$ is well–defined only in the context of a given derivation).

We call such a t thoroughly minimal.

Proof.

We show that for each derivation of a minimal t wrt. N a derivation of some thoroughly minimal t'' wrt. N exists, by induction on the structure of t:

Let $N \longrightarrow f(N_1, \ldots, N_n) \xrightarrow{*} f(t_1, \ldots, t_n) = t$ and t be minimal wrt. N.

Since $t_i \in \mathcal{L}(N_i) \neq \{\}$, we can find a derivation $N_i \xrightarrow{*} t_i'$ of some minimal t_i' wrt. N_i.

By I.H., we find for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ a derivation $N_i \xrightarrow{*} t_i''$ of some thoroughly minimal t_i'' wrt. N_i.

Let $t'' := f(t_1'', \ldots, t_n'')$,

then $\mathsf{wg}(t'') = \overline{f}(\mathsf{wg}(N_1), \ldots, \mathsf{wg}(N_n)) \leqslant \overline{f}(\mathsf{wg}(t_1), \ldots, \mathsf{wg}(t_n)) = \mathsf{wg}(t) = \mathsf{wg}(N)$,

hence t'' is minimal, and therefor also thoroughly minimal, wrt. N. □

Lemma 17.
If $\mathsf{wg}(N) < \infty$*, then* $N \in D^{(k)}$ *for some* k*.*

Proof.
If $\mathsf{wg}(N) < \infty$, we can find some derivation $N \xrightarrow{*} t$ of some thoroughly minimal t wrt. N by Lem. 16.
We show that t thoroughly minimal wrt. N and $\mathsf{wg}(t) < \infty$ implies $x_N^{(k)} \leqslant \mathsf{wg}(t)$ and $N \in D^{(k)}$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, by induction on the structure of t:
Let $t = f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$. Then $N \longrightarrow f(N_1, \ldots, N_n)$ for some N_i, each t_i is thoroughly minimal wrt. N_i, and $\mathsf{wg}(N_i) = \mathsf{wg}(t_i) \leqslant \mathsf{wg}(t) < \infty$.
By I.H., we get some k_i with $x_{N_i}^{(k_i)} \leqslant \mathsf{wg}(t_i)$ and $N_i \in D^{(k_i)}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$.
Let $k := \max\{k_1, \ldots, k_n\}$. Then

$x_N^{(k+1)}$	
$\leqslant \overline{f}(x_{N_1}^{(k)}, \ldots, x_{N_n}^{(k)})$	by Alg. 10, since $N_i \in D^{(k)}$ by Lem. 11.2
$\leqslant \overline{f}(\mathsf{wg}(t_1), \ldots, \mathsf{wg}(t_n))$	since $x_{N_i}^{(k)} \leqslant x_{N_i}^{(k_i)} \leqslant \mathsf{wg}(t_i)$ by Lem. 11.3
$= \mathsf{wg}(t)$	by Def. $\mathsf{wg}(\cdot)$
$< \infty$	by assumption

From Lem. 11.4, we get $N \in D^{(k')}$ for some k'.
Setting $k'' := \max\{k+1, k'\}$,
we have $x_N^{(k'')} \leqslant x_N^{(k+1)} \leqslant \mathsf{wg}(t)$ and $N \in D^{(k')} \subseteq D^{(k'')}$ by Lem. 11.3 and 2. □

Lemma 18.
$F^{(k+1)} = \{\}$ *iff* $D^{(k)} = \{N \in \mathcal{N} \mid \mathsf{wg}(N) < \infty\}$.
In this case, we reached a fixpoint,
i.e. $M^{(k+1)} = \{\}$, $D^{(k+1)} = D^{(k)}$, $x_N^{(k+2)} = x_N^{(k+1)}$, *and* $F^{(k+2)} = \{\}$.

Proof.

1. $D^{(k+1)} = D^{(k)} \Rightarrow x_N^{(k+2)} = x_N^{(k+1)}$:

$x_N^{(k+2)}$		
$= \min(\{x_N^{(k+1)}\} \cup\{\overline{f}_i(\ldots x_{N_{ij}}^{(k+1)}\ldots) \mid 1 \leqslant i \leqslant m,\ \bigwedge_{j=1}^{n_i} N_{ij} \in D^{(k+1)}\})$		Alg.10
$= \min(\{x_N^{(k+1)}\} \cup\{\overline{f}_i(\ldots x_{N_{ij}}^{(k+1)}\ldots) \mid 1 \leqslant i \leqslant m,\ \bigwedge_{j=1}^{n_i} N_{ij} \in D^{(k)}\})$		ass.
$= \min(\{x_N^{(k+1)}\} \cup\{\overline{f}_i(\ldots x_{N_{ij}}^{(k)}\ldots) \mid 1 \leqslant i \leqslant m,\ \bigwedge_{j=1}^{n_i} N_{ij} \in D^{(k)}\})$		Cor.13.1
$\geqslant \min(\{x_N^{(k+1)}, x_N^{(k)}\} \cup\{\overline{f}_i(\ldots x_{N_{ij}}^{(k)}\ldots) \mid 1 \leqslant i \leqslant m,\ \bigwedge_{j=1}^{n_i} N_{ij} \in D^{(k)}\})$		min
$= x_N^{(k+1)}$		Alg.10
$\geqslant x_N^{(k+2)}$		Lem.11.3

2. If $F^{(k+1)} = \{\}$, we reached a fixpoint:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& F^{(k+1)} = \{\} \\
\Rightarrow\ & M^{(k+1)} = \{\} && \text{by Def. } M^{(k+1)} \\
\Rightarrow\ & D^{(k+1)} = D^{(k)} && \text{by Lem. 11.1} \\
\Rightarrow\ & x_N^{(k+2)} = x_N^{(k+1)} \text{ for all } N \in \mathcal{N} && \text{by 1.} \\
\Rightarrow\ & F^{(k+2)} = \{\} && \text{by Def. } F^{(\cdot)}\text{, since } F^{(k+1)} = \{\}
\end{aligned}
$$

3. $F^{(k+1)} = \{\} \Leftarrow D^{(k)} = \{N \in \mathcal{N} \mid \mathsf{wg}(N) < \infty\}$:
   Assume for contradiction $F^{(k+1)} \neq \{\}$.
   By Lem. 11.2, we have $N \in M^{(k+1)} \subseteq F^{(k+1)}$ for some N with $\mathsf{wg}(N) = \infty$.
   By Lem. 15, $\mathsf{wg}(t) = x_N^{(k+1)}$ for some $t \in \mathcal{L}(N)$.
   Hence, $\mathsf{wg}(N) \leqslant \mathsf{wg}(t) = x_N^{(k+1)} < \infty$, which is a contradiction.
4. Let $F^{(k+1)} = \{\}$, we show $\mathsf{wg}(N) < \infty \Leftrightarrow N \in D^{(k)}$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathsf{wg}(N) < \infty \\
\Rightarrow\ & N \in D^{(k')} \text{ for some } k' && \text{by Lem. 17} \\
\Rightarrow\ & N \in D^{(k)} && \text{since } D^{(k')} \subseteq D^{(k)} \text{ by 2. and Lem. 11.2} \\
\Rightarrow\ & \mathsf{wg}(N) \leqslant x_N^{(k)} && \text{by Lem. 15} \\
\wedge\ & x_N^{(k)} < \infty && \text{by Lem. 11.4}
\end{aligned}
$$

□

Lemma 19.
If $F^{(k+1)} = \{\}$, then $x_N^{(k)} \leqslant \mathsf{wg}(t)$ for all $N \in \mathcal{N}$ and all $t \in \mathcal{L}(N)$.

Proof. Induction on t:
Let $t = f(t_1, \ldots, t_n) \in \mathcal{L}(N)$,
i.e., $N ::= \ldots f(N_1, \ldots, N_n) \ldots$ and $t_j \in \mathcal{L}(N_j)$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n$.
If $\mathsf{wg}(t_j) = \infty$ for some j, then $x_N^{(k)} \leqslant \infty = \mathsf{wg}(t)$, since $\overline{f}$ is increasing.
If $\mathsf{wg}(t_j) < \infty$ for all j, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& x_N^{(k)} \\
=\ & x_N^{(k+1)} && \text{by Lem. 18.2} \\
\leqslant\ & \overline{f}(x_{N_1}^{(k)}, \ldots, x_{N_n}^{(k)}) && \text{by Alg. 10, since } N_j \in D^{(k)} \text{ for all } j \text{ by Lem. 18.3} \\
\leqslant\ & \overline{f}(\mathsf{wg}(t_1), \ldots, \mathsf{wg}(t_n)) && \text{I.H., } \overline{f} \text{ monotonic} \\
=\ & \mathsf{wg}(t) && \text{Def. } \mathsf{wg}
\end{aligned}
$$

□

Corollary 20.
(Correctness of Alg. 10) *If $F^{(k+1)} = \{\}$, then $x_N^{(k)} = \mathsf{wg}(N)$ for all $N \in \mathcal{N}$.*

Proof.
By Lem. 11.2, we have $F^{(k+1)} = \{\}$ for some $k \leqslant nt$.
By Lem. 18.2 and 3, thus $F^{(nt+1)} = \{\}$ and $D^{(nt)} = \{N \in \mathcal{N} \mid \mathsf{wg}(N) < \infty\}$.
By Lem. 19, we have $x_N^{(nt)} \leqslant \mathsf{wg}(N)$ for all $N \in \mathcal{N}$.
By Lem. 15, we have $x_N^{(nt)} \geqslant \mathsf{wg}(N)$ for all $N \in D^{(nt)}$.
For all $N \in \mathcal{N} \setminus D^{(nt)}$, we have $\forall k: \ N \notin D^{(k)}$ by Lem. 18.2 and 11.2,
hence $\mathsf{wg}(N) = \infty = x_N^{(nt)}$ by Lem. 11.4. □

We now duplicate the transformation from Alg. 2 to Alg. 7 for Alg. 10:

Algorithm 21.
Replace in Alg. 10 the definition rule for $x_N^{(k+1)}$, and $F^{(k+1)}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} x_N^{(k+1)} &:= \min(\{x_N^{(k)}\} \cup \{\, \overline{f}_i(x_{N_{i1}}^{(k)}, \ldots, x_{N_{in_i}}^{(k)}) \mid 1 \leqslant i \leqslant m \wedge \\ &\qquad\qquad (\textstyle\bigwedge_{j=1}^{n_i} N_{ij} \in D^{(k)}) \wedge (\bigvee_{j=1}^{n_i} N_{ij} \in M^{(k)})\}) \text{, and} \\ F^{(k+1)} &:= (F^{(k)} \cup \{N \mid x_N^{(k+1)} < x_N^{(k)}\}) \setminus M^{(k)} \qquad\qquad , \end{aligned}$$

while all other definitions remain unchanged. □

Lemma 22.
(Correctness of Alg. 21) *In Alg. 21, each $x_N^{(k)}$, and each $F^{(k)}$ has the same value in Alg. 21 as in Alg. 10.*

Proof. "$x_N^{(k)}$": Induction on k using Lem. 12.
"$F^{(k)}$": follows immediately from Lem. 14. □

To estimate the complexity of Alg. 21, we need the following

Lemma 23.
For each alternative $\overline{f}_i(x_{N_{i1}}^{(k)}, \ldots, x_{N_{in_i}}^{(k)})$,
the formula $(\bigwedge_{j=1}^{n_i} N_{ij} \in D^{(k)}) \wedge (\bigvee_{j=1}^{n_i} N_{ij} \in M^{(k)})$ holds for at most one k.

Proof. For each $j \in \{1, \ldots, n_i\}$, N_{ij} is in at most one $M^{(k)}$ by Lem. 11.1.
Denoting this k by k_j, we have $N_{ij} \notin D^{(k)}$ for all $k < k_j$, again by Lem. 11.1.
Hence, the formula can hold at most for $k = \max\{k_1, \ldots, k_{n_i}\}$. □

Corollary 24.
(Complexity of Alg. 21)
Algorithm 21 has a time complexity of $\mathcal{O}(al \cdot (ar + \log nt))$.
Its memory complexity is that of the input grammar, viz. $\mathcal{O}(al \cdot ar)$.

Proof. Due to the different access modes, the sets $F^{(\cdot)}$, $M^{(\cdot)}$, and $D^{(\cdot)}$ can be implemented by a heap [AHU74, Sect. 3.4], a linked list, and a bit vector, respectively. Due to Lem. 11.6, it is sufficient to enter a nonterminal N into the heap iff $x_N^{(\cdot)}$ is decreased for the first time.

We add a counter in the range $\{0, \ldots, ar\}$ to each alternative

$$N ::= \ldots f_i(N_{i1}, \ldots, N_{in_i}) \ldots,$$

which counts the number of N_{ij} with $N_{ij} \in D^{(k)}$. It is initially 0 and is increased when some N_{ij} is added to $D^{(k)}$ and we visit all alternatives N_{ij} occurs in. If the counter of an alternative reaches its arity n_i, we know that the formula

$$(\bigwedge_{j=1}^{n_i} N_{ij} \in D^{(k)}) \wedge (\bigvee_{j=1}^{n_i} N_{ij} \in M^{(k)})$$

holds, and evaluate the alternative, setting $x_N^{(k+1)} := \min\{x_N^{(k)},\ \overline{f}_i(x_{N_{i1}}^{(k)}, \ldots, x_{N_{in_i}}^{(k)})\}$. It may be neccessary to reorder the heap $F^{(\cdot)}$ to get N to its appropriate place. Since the value of $x_N^{(\cdot)}$ cannot have grown, it is sufficient to move N upwards in the heap. After evaluation, the alternative will not be considered any more during the algorithm.

For a certain alternative, increasing and checking the counter takes at most $ar \cdot \mathcal{O}(1)$ time, evaluation of $\overline{f}$ takes $\mathcal{O}(ar)$ time, reordering the heap takes $\mathcal{O}(\log nt)$ time, and all other set operations are dominated by the latter. Hence, the overall time complexity is $\mathcal{O}(al \cdot (ar + \log nt))$. The memory complexity is obvious, since the input grammar dominates all other data structures, including the counters.

If we omit the counters, we get a time complexity of $\mathcal{O}(al \cdot (ar^2 + \log nt))$, since each of the n_i times we visit an alternative N_{ij} occurs in, we have to test whether $\bigwedge_{j'=1}^{n_i} N_{ij'} \in D^{(k)}$. For small values of ar, this complexity may be acceptable, and we can avoid to extend a possibly huge input grammar by additional counter fields. If alternatives are stored in prefix form in memory, i.e. one word for f, followed by n_i words for $N_{i1}, \ldots, N_{in_i}$, it is sufficient to add two binary flags to each nonterminal of each alternative, one indicating whether it has been visited, the other indicating whether it is the rightmost argument of its alternative. The latter flag should be set in the word for f, too, in order to delimit the memory area for $N_{i1}, \ldots, N_{in_i}$ to the left. □

k	Q_0	P_1	Q_1	P_2	Q_2
	x F D	x F D	x F D	x F D	x F D
0	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞
1	a 0 + +				
2	+	pa 0 + +	ja 1 +		
3	+	+	qpa 0 + +		
4	+	+	+	$pqpa$ 0 + +	$jqpa$ 1 +
5	+	+	+	+	$qpqpa$ 0 + +
6	+	+	+	+	+

Fig. 3. Lazy propagation algorithm Alg. 10

Consider again the grammar and the weight functions from Fig. 1. Figure 3 shows the cycles of Alg. 10 in computing the weights of each Q_n and P_n, where $n_{\max} = 2$. For each nonterminal N, we show (from left to right) a term of weight $x_N^{(k)}$, the value of $x_N^{(k)}$, a flag indicating whether $N \in F^{(k)}$, and flag indicating whether $N \in D^{(k)}$. A "+" flag indicates that the corresponding relation holds, an empty flag field indicates the contrary. An empty x field means that $x_N^{(k)} = x_N^{(k-1)}$. The algorithms stops after cycle 6 since $F^{(6)} = \{\}$. Note that each alternative of each rule is evaluated just once.

5 Partial weight orderings

It would be desirable to provide an equivalent to Alg. 21 for a partial weight order $(<)$ on D. This would allow us to define weight functions such that $\mathsf{wg}(t)$ is the set of distinct variables occuring in t. In many applications, a term is more interesting if it contains fewer distinct variables. For example, if terms denote transformation rules, $f(x) \rightsquigarrow g(x)$ is usually preferred over $f(x) \rightsquigarrow g(y)$. However, we have the following negative results.

Lemma 25.
There is no total nontrivial order $(<)$ on the power set $\wp(\mathcal{V})$ of variables such that $V \subseteq W \Rightarrow V \leqslant W$ for all $V, W \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ and $(\cup)$ is monotonic wrt. $(<)$.

Proof. Let $x, y, z \in \mathcal{V}$. If $\{x, y\} < \{x, z\}$, then $\{y\} \leqslant \{x, y\} < \{x, z\}$ and trivially $\{x, z\} \leqslant \{x, z\}$; hence $\{x, y, z\} \leqslant \{x, z\}$ by monotonicity. Similarly, $\{x, z\} < \{x, y\}$ implies $\{x, y, z\} \leqslant \{x, y\}$. In each case, there are two sets $V \neq W$ such that $V \leqslant W \leqslant V$. □

Definition 26.
It is straight-forward to generalize the definitions from Sect. 2 to non-total orderings. A partial order $(<)$ *on the power set* $\wp(\mathcal{V})$ *of variables can be defined by:* $v_1 < v_2 \Leftrightarrow v_1 \subsetneq v_2$ *for all* $v_1, v_2 \subseteq \mathcal{V}$.

If we define $\overline{x} = \{x\}$ *for each variable* $x \in \mathcal{V}$, *and* $\overline{f}(v_1, \ldots, v_n) = v_1 \cup \ldots \cup v_n$ *for each* n*-ary function, including constants, we get* $\mathsf{wg}(t) = \mathrm{var}(t)$. *That is, a weight is a set of variables.*

Not every set of weights has a unique minimal element, since $(<)$ *is not total. Therefore, we define for a set* T *of terms*

$$\mathsf{wg}(T) = \{v \subseteq \mathcal{V} \mid (\exists t \in T : \ \mathsf{wg}(t) = v) \wedge (\neg \exists t' \in T : \ \mathsf{wg}(t) < v)\}.$$

In contrast to Sect. 2, $\mathsf{wg}(T) \subseteq \mathsf{D}$ *is a set of weights rather than a single weight.* □

The following notion is needed for Lem. 29 below.

Definition 27.
For m *sets* $S_1, \ldots, S_m$ *of sets, define* $\bigcup_{i=1}^m S_i = \{\bigcup_{i=1}^m s_i \mid \bigwedge_{i=1}^m s_i \in S_i\}$ *as their pointwise union.*

For example, if $S_1 = \{\{a, b, c\}, \{a, d, e\}\}$ *and* $S_2 = \{\{b, c, d\}, \{d, e\}\}$, *we have* $\bigcup_{i=1}^2 S_i = \{\{a, b, c, d\}, \{a, b, c, d, e\}, \{a, d, e\}\}$. □

Lemma 28.
The pointwise set union from Def. 27 has the following properties:

1. *If* $\bigwedge_{i=1}^m s \in S_i$, *then* $s \in \bigcup_{i=1}^m S_i$.
2. *If* $s \in \bigcup_{i=1}^m S_i$, *then* $\bigwedge_{i=1}^m \exists s_i \in S_i : s_i \subseteq s$.
3. *If* $\#s = n$ *and* $\bigwedge_{i=1}^m \bigwedge_{s_i \in S_i} \#s_i = n$, *then* $\bigwedge_{i=1}^m s \in S_i \Leftrightarrow s \in \bigcup_{i=1}^m S_i$.

Proof.

1. By Def. 27, $s = \bigcup_{i=1}^m s$ is an element of $\bigcup_{i=1}^m S_i$.
2. If $s = \bigcup_{i=1}^m s_i$, then $s_i \subseteq s$ for each i.
3. Follows from 1 and 2. □

Lemma 29.
The problem to compute minimal nonterminal weights wrt. $(<)$ *from Def. 26 is NP hard.*

Proof. Let a conjunctive normal form C be given. Let $\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ be the set of propositional variables occurring in C. Without loss of generality, we assume

$$\begin{aligned} C &\Leftrightarrow D_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge D_m && \text{and} \\ D_i &\Leftrightarrow A_{i1} \vee \ldots \vee A_{in_i} && \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, n_i, \text{ where} \\ A_{ij} &\in \{x_j, (\neg x_j)\} && \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, m \text{ and } j = 1, \ldots, n_i \ . \end{aligned}$$

We use a signature $\Sigma = \{c, d\} \cup \{y_1, \ldots, y_n\} \cup \{z_1, \ldots, z_n\}$ and consider $y_1, \ldots, y_n$ and $z_1, \ldots, z_n$ as variables. Consider the following grammar:

$$\begin{aligned} C' &::= c(D'_1, \ldots, D'_m). && \\ D'_i &::= \psi(A_{i1}) \mid \ldots \mid \psi(A_{in_i}), && i = 1, \ldots, m. \\ P_j &::= y_j, && j = 1, \ldots, n. \\ N_j &::= z_j, && j = 1, \ldots, n. \\ F_j &::= y_j \mid z_j, && j = 1, \ldots, n, \end{aligned}$$

where ψ is a mapping from atoms to alternatives defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(x_j) &= d(F_1, \ldots, P_j, \ldots, F_n) \\ \psi(\neg x_j) &= d(F_1, \ldots, N_j, \ldots, F_n) \end{aligned}$$

The grammar has $1 + m + n \cdot 3$ rules and $1 + (\sum_{i=1}^{m} n_i) + n \cdot 4$ alternatives, while the conjunctive normal form has $\sum_{i=1}^{m} n_i$ atoms. Observe that the set $\mathcal{L}(C')$ of all terms derivable from C' is finite, since the grammar does not contain recursive rules; similarly, all $\mathcal{L}(D'_i)$ are finite. If α is a nonterminal or an alternative, define $\xi(\alpha) = \{\mathrm{var}(t) \mid t \in \mathcal{L}(\alpha)\}$.

For example, from $(x_1 \vee \neg x_3) \wedge (\neg x_2 \vee x_3)$, we obtain the grammar

$$\begin{aligned} C' &::= c(D'_1, D'_2), \\ D'_1 &::= d(P_1, F_2, F_3) \mid d(F_1, F_2, N_3), \\ D'_2 &::= d(F_1, N_2, F_3) \mid d(F_1, F_2, P_3), \\ P_1 &::= y_1, \qquad P_2 ::= y_2, \qquad P_3 ::= y_3, \\ N_1 &::= z_1, \qquad N_2 ::= z_2, \qquad N_3 ::= z_3, \\ F_1 &::= y_1 \mid z_1, \quad F_2 ::= y_2 \mid z_2, \quad F_3 ::= y_3 \mid z_3. \end{aligned}$$

We call a mapping $\sigma : \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \longrightarrow \{\mathit{true}, \mathit{false}\}$ a truth value assignment. Each such mapping can be homomorphically extended to all propositional formulas over $\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$.

Define $V = \{\{w_1, \ldots, w_n\} \mid \bigwedge_{j=1}^{n} w_j \in \{y_j, z_j\}\}$. Each member of V is a set of cardinality n. Define a bijective mapping ρ from truth value assignments to V by $\rho(\sigma) = \{y_j \mid \sigma(x_j) = \mathit{true}\} \cup \{z_j \mid \sigma(x_j) = \mathit{false}\}$.

Observe the following facts:

1. Each $\xi(\psi(A_{ij}))$ is a subset of V:
   This follows from the definition of $\psi(A_{ij})$. In the example, $\xi(\psi(\neg x_3)) = \{\{y_1, y_2, z_3\}, \{y_1, z_2, z_3\}, \{z_1, y_2, z_3\}, \{z_1, z_2, z_3\}\}$.
2. Each $\xi(D'_i)$ is a subset of V:
   This follows from 1, using $\mathcal{L}(D'_i) = \bigcup_{j=1}^{n_i} \mathcal{L}(\psi(A_{ij}))$ and the definition of ξ. In the example, we have

   $$\xi(D'_1) = \{\{y_1, y_2, y_3\}, \{y_1, y_2, z_3\}, \{y_1, z_2, y_3\}, \{y_1, z_2, z_3\}, \{z_1, y_2, z_3\}, \{z_1, z_2, z_3\}\},$$
   $$\xi(D'_2) = \{\{y_1, y_2, y_3\}, \{y_1, z_2, y_3\}, \{y_1, z_2, z_3\}, \{z_1, y_2, y_3\}, \{z_1, z_2, y_3\}, \{z_1, z_2, z_3\}\}.$$

3. An atom A_{ij} is satisfied by a truth value assignment σ iff $\rho(\sigma) \in \xi(\psi(A_{ij}))$:
   If $A_{ij} = x_j$, then

   $$\begin{aligned}
   & \xi(\psi(A_{ij})) \\
   = \ & \xi(d(F_1, \ldots, P_j, \ldots, F_n)) && \text{Def. } \psi \\
   = \ & \{\mathrm{var}(t) \mid t \in \mathcal{L}(d(F_1, \ldots, P_j, \ldots, F_n))\} && \text{Def. } \xi \\
   = \ & \{\{w_1, \ldots, y_j, \ldots, w_n\} \mid \textstyle\bigwedge_{k \neq j} w_k \in \{y_k, z_k\}\} && \text{Def. } \mathcal{L}, \mathrm{var}, F_k, P_j \\
   = \ & \{v \in V \mid y_j \in v\} && \text{Def. } V
   \end{aligned}$$

   Hence,

   $$\begin{aligned}
   & A_{ij} \text{ is satisfied by } \sigma \\
   \Leftrightarrow \ & \sigma(x_j) = \mathit{true} && A_{ij} = x_j \\
   \Leftrightarrow \ & y_j \in \rho(\sigma) && \text{Def. } \rho \\
   \Leftrightarrow \ & \rho(\sigma) \in \xi(\psi(A_{ij})) && \text{by the above argument}
   \end{aligned}$$

   If $A_{ij} = (\neg x_j)$, then similarly $\xi(\psi(A_{ij})) = \{v \in V \mid z_j \in v\}$;
   and σ satisfies A_{ij} iff $\rho(\sigma) \in \xi(\psi(A_{ij}))$.
4. A disjunct D_i is satisfied by a truth value assignment σ iff $\rho(\sigma) \in \xi(D'_i)$:

   $$\begin{aligned}
   & \sigma \text{ satisfies } D_i \\
   \Leftrightarrow \ & \exists j : \ \sigma \text{ satisfies } A_{ij} && \text{Def. } D_i \\
   \Leftrightarrow \ & \exists j : \ \rho(\sigma) \in \xi(\psi(A_{ij})) && \text{by 3} \\
   \Leftrightarrow \ & \rho(\sigma) \in \textstyle\bigcup_{j=1}^{n_i} \xi(\psi(A_{ij})) \\
   \Leftrightarrow \ & \rho(\sigma) \in \xi(\textstyle\bigmid_{j=1}^{n_i} \psi(A_{ij})) && \text{Def. } \xi, \mathcal{L} \\
   \Leftrightarrow \ & \rho(\sigma) \in \xi(D'_i) && \text{Def. } D'_i
   \end{aligned}$$

5. $\mathsf{wg}(C') \subseteq \xi(C') = \bigcup_{i=1}^{m} \xi(D'_i)$:
   The inclusion from the definition of wg. The equality follows from the definitions of ξ, $\mathcal{L}$, and var. In the example, we have $\mathsf{wg}(C') = \{\{y_1, y_2, y_3\}, \{y_1, z_2, y_3\}, \{y_1, z_2, z_3\}, \{z_1, z_2, z_3\}, \{z_1, y_2, y_3, z_3\}\}$ and e.g. $\{y_1, z_1, y_2, y_3\} \in \xi(C') \setminus \mathsf{wg}(C')$.

6. C is satisfied by a truth value assignment σ iff $\rho(\sigma) \in \xi(C')$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sigma \text{ satisfies } C \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & \forall i:\ \sigma \text{ satisfies } D_i && \text{Def. } C \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & \forall i:\ \rho(\sigma) \in \xi(D'_i) && \text{by 4} \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & \rho(\sigma) \in \bigcup_{i=1}^{m} \xi(D'_i) && \text{by 2 and Lem. 28.3} \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & \rho(\sigma) \in \xi(C') && \text{by 5}
\end{aligned}$$

7. Let v be a member of $\mathsf{wg}(C')$ with least cardinality. C is satisfiable iff $\#v = n$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \#v = n \\
\Rightarrow\ & \forall i:\ v \in \xi(D'_i) && \text{by Lem. 28.3, using 5 and 2} \\
\Rightarrow\ & v \in V && \text{by 2} \\
\Rightarrow\ & \exists \sigma:\ v = \rho(\sigma) && \rho \text{ bijective} \\
\Rightarrow\ & \sigma \text{ satisfies } C' && \text{by 6} \\
\Rightarrow\ & \#v \leqslant n && \text{since } v \text{ has minimal cardinality in } \xi(C') \\
\Rightarrow\ & \#v = n && \text{by 5, 2, and Lem. 28.2}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the NP complete problem to decide the satisifiability of a conjunctive normal form C has been reduced to the problem to compute the minimal cardinality of a set from $\mathsf{wg}(C')$. □

References

[AHU74] Alfred V. Aho, John E. Hopcroft, and Jeffrey D. Ullman. *The Design and Analysis of Computer Algorithms*. Addison-Wesley, 1974.

[AM91] A. Aiken and B. Murphy. Implementing regular tree expressions. In *ACM Conference on Functional Programming Languages and Computer Architecture*, pages 427–447, Aug 1991.

[BB91] J.M. Barzdin and G.J. Barzdin. Rapid construction of algebraic axioms from samples. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 90:199–208, 1991.

[BGW93] Leo Bachmair, Harald Ganzinger, and Uwe Waldmann. Set constraints are the monadic class. In *Eight Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, pages 75–83, 1993.

[Bur95] J. Burghardt. Regular substitution sets: A means of controlling E-unification. volume 914 of *LNCS*, pages 382–396. Springer-Verlag, 1995.

[Bur02] Jochen Burghardt. Axiomatization of finite algebras. In *Proc. KI 2002*, number 2479 in LNAI, pages 222–234. Springer, 2002.

[CDG+99] H. Comon, M. Dauchet, R. Gilleron, F. Jacquemard, D. Lugiez, S. Tison, and M. Tommasi. *Tree Automata Techniques and Applications*. Available from `www.grappa.univ-lille3.fr/tata`, Oct 1999.

[Com89] H. Comon. Inductive proofs by specification transformation. volume 355 of *LNCS*, pages 76–91. Springer, 1989.

[Com90] Hubert Comon. Equational formulas in order-sorted algebras. In *Proc. ICALP*, 1990.

[DJ90] N. Dershowitz and J.-P. Jouannaud. *Rewrite Systems*, volume B of *Handbook of Theoretical Computer Science*, pages 243–320. Elsevier, 1990.

[Emm91] Helmut Emmelmann. Code selection by regularly controlled term rewriting. In Susan L. Graham Robert Giegerich, editor, *Code Generation — Concepts, Tools, Techniques, Proc. Int. Workshop on Code Generation, Dagstuhl/Saarland*, Workshops in Computing, pages 3–29. Springer, May 1991.

[Emm94] Helmut Emmelmann. *Codeselektion mit regulr gesteuerter Termersetzung.* PhD thesis, University Karlsruhe, 1994.

[Hei94] Birgit Heinz. Lemma discovery by anti-unification of regular sorts. Technical Report 94–21, TU Berlin, 1994.

[Hei95] Birgit Heinz. *Anti-Unifikation modulo Gleichungstheorie und deren Anwendung zur Lemmagenerierung.* PhD thesis, TU Berlin, Dec 1995.

[McA92] David McAllester. Grammar rewriting. In *Proc. CADE-11*, volume 607 of *LNAI*. Springer, 1992.

[SS88] Manfred Schmidt-Schau. *Computational Aspects of an Order-Sorted Logic with Term Declarations.* PhD thesis, Univ. Kaiserslautern, Apr 1988.

[TW68] J.W. Thatcher and J.B. Wright. Generalized finite automata theory with an application to a decision problem of second-order logic. *Mathematical Systems Theory*, 2(1), 1968.

[Uri92] T.E. Uribe. Sorted unification using set constraints. In D. Kapur, editor, *Proc. CADE–11*, volume 607 of *LNCS*, pages 163–177, 1992.